

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

RAGHAVENDRAN SHANKAR,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C24-0308-JCC

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court *sua sponte*. The Court previously cautioned Plaintiff against engaging in abusive behavior with the Court, its staff, or opposing parties. (*See* Dkt. No. 86 at 2–3.) To that end, the Court warned Plaintiff that if he continued to file any frivolous motions or otherwise engage in abusive or threatening communications, then the Court would impose pre-filing conditions upon Plaintiff. (*See id.*) Nevertheless, Plaintiff continues to submit frivolous filings, (*see generally* Dkt. Nos. 87, 88, 89), send e-mails to the Court’s inbox, and make various unreasonable requests to the Clerk’s office.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1651, the Court may enjoin a vexatious litigant to restrict access to the Court. Before doing so, the litigant must be given notice and a chance to be heard. *De Long v. Hennessey*, 912 F.2d 1144, 1148 (9th Cir. 1990). Accordingly, the Court ORDERS Plaintiff to show cause why the Court should not impose a vexatious litigant order for his repeated abuses of the judicial process in this matter. Such an order would limit Plaintiff’s ability

1 to file frivolous motions and/or bring future claims against Defendant before this Court.
2 Plaintiff's response must be filed no later than twenty-one (21) days from the date of this order
3 and may not exceed five (5) pages in length. The Court will not consider a response that exceeds
4 five (5) pages in length. Moreover, as the Court has noted time and again, (*see* Dkt. Nos. 68 at 1,
5 74 at 11), it will only consider Plaintiff's first-filed response *unless* Plaintiff submits a praecipe
6 consistent with the procedure for amending filings as articulated in LCR 7(m). Thus, any filing
7 that is unresponsive to the order to show cause will be stricken from the record.

8 Finally, the Court advises Plaintiff that if he remains vindicated in the validity of his
9 claims, he may appeal the Court's final judgment (Dkt. No. 75) to the Ninth Circuit Court of
10 Appeals. Should Plaintiff choose to file an appeal, the Court encourages him to review the Ninth
11 Circuit Court of Appeals' website for *pro se* litigants ([https://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/forms/pro-](https://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/forms/pro-se-litigants/)
12 [se-litigants/](https://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/forms/pro-se-litigants/)).

13
14 DATED this 30th day of October 2024.

15
16
17 

18 John C. Coughenour
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26